

Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee

Meeting 8 Notes

November 17, 2004

Spokane

Members & Alternates:

Bob Alberts	Tom Fox	Gary Rhoades	Dawn Vyvyan
Bruce Beauchene	David Fujimoto	George Schlender	Donald Wright
Ben Bonkowski	Richard Gustav	Steve Skipworth	
Marla Carter	David Johnson	Debbie Thomas	
Lynn Coleman	Bob Pancoast	Frank Triplett	
Gene Eckhardt	Jerry Peterson	Judy Turpin	

DOH Staff & Consultants:

Michelle Austin	Richard Siffert
Denise Clifford	Deana Taylor
Rich Hoey	Leslie Thorpe

Others:

Patti Godwin	Eric Nelson
Danford Moore	

I. Introduction and Housekeeping

- A. Jim Rioux and Jennifer Kropack were unable to attend the meeting due to illness.
- B. Connie Krueger was not present, but indicated to Rich Hoey that she will be participating in the upcoming meetings. Due to vacancies at her office and workload issues, she has not been able to participate.
- C. Summary of Leakage Input from the Drinking Water Seminars will be presented at the next subcommittee meeting.
- D. Rich Hoey reminded the alternates to share their comments with the subcommittee. Rich wants to make sure everybody has the opportunity to provide comments.
- E. Rich Hoey mentioned the three sub-workgroups (Performance Reporting and Accountability, Data Collection, and Cost Effectiveness) have met twice. The work that has been completed by the sub-workgroups will now be presented to the full WUE Subcommittee. Their work will set the stage for the discussion by presenting viable options. It will be up to the subcommittee to provide feedback on 1) which option makes sense, and 2) any major issues the sub-workgroup missed.

II. Meeting 7 Minutes Review

Rich Hoey outlined the highlights from the Meeting 7 Minutes.

A. Program Model Discussion: Jim Rioux is putting the WUE Program Model Matrixes 1 and 2 into one matrix per discussion from the last subcommittee meeting. Jim Rioux is also working on examples of what requirements could look like for different sized water systems.

- i. Rich Hoey stated that the definitions will be clarified to avoid subjective and/or difference of opinion of interpretations.

ACTION: DOH to provide case examples of various water system sizes on how they may need to address leakage, conservation, etc. in order to meet requirements.

ACTION: DOH will change Section III, B, iv, on page two, in the meeting 7 minutes to clarify the discussion.

B. Conservation Measures Discussion: DOH is still talking internally about what conservation measures should be required and what authority they have to require specific conservation measures.

- i. DOH is still evaluating requirements for service meters.
- ii. It should be put into the requirements for utilities maintaining source meters that they should be in good working condition. This needs to be clarified in the notes.

ACTION: DOH will change Section VII, B, on page five, in the meeting 7 minutes to clarify the discussion.

III. Subcommittee Discussion: Performance Reporting and Accountability: Goal Setting – Richard Siffert

- A. It was noted that the focus on this discussion will be on the goal setting portion, because this will be written into the rule. This piece is very important!
- B. It was also clarified that proposed rules apply to individual utilities, not just Satellite Management Entity. It was stated that the report does not reflect this accurately.
- C. There is a difference between setting goals and achieving goals, which largely depends on the customers. The Performance Reporting and Accountability should focus on meeting conservation goals.
- D. It was noted by Jerry Petersen that UTC regulated systems are a unique group in which DOH should be sensitive to this when writing the regulations.

E. Section 2.2 Process, 2.2.3 Process Elements:

- i. When should information, such as time and place of meeting, what lead the utility to make this goal, outline of program, etc., be made available to customers and general public? Concern with informing people ahead of public meeting. There should be two public meetings. Layout options in meeting one and then adoption at meeting 2.
- ii. Complications for SMAs – may not be owner (absentee) and may have many systems. Goals for each system may need to be different (potential for lots of meetings).
- iii. There are public hearing laws for each different entity. Should be able to use existing process (board meeting, public hearing).
- iv. Everett does conservation programs for wholesalers. Would each system have to do a public meeting or could they delegate authority? Legislation states governing body must have meeting and set goals.
- v. No issue with 14 day public notice, but UTC water systems may need to go through commission for certain goals for Tariff (30 days notice for that). The 14 day public notice requirement should be put into the regulation.
- vi. Discussion about ‘umbrella goal setting’ for all systems (if multiple systems). One meeting is OK. Concern with one umbrella goal for all systems when they are so different.

F. Section 2.3 Frequency of Goal Adoption:

- i. There was a question raised on how soon will systems be expected to adopt a goal?
- ii. Discussion about the frequency of goal setting. Opinion were expressed it should be done annually and others expressed it should be less frequent (i.e. part of plan update), but more thoroughly. Suggestion that frequency should increase if system was “enhanced”.
- iii. There were concerns stated about the philosophy of the law. One felt we are ‘missing the boat’ on the goal setting aspect and it should be done more frequently.
- iv. Some felt there was a disconnect between options 2 and 3. A formal process for new goals does not need to happen annually. Many need to evaluate and adjust goal more often. Others agreed with option 2.
- v. DOH acknowledged that if goal setting is part of plan process, would need to work on what to do with systems developing SWSMPs.

IV. Continuation of Subcommittee Discussion: Performance Reporting and Accountability: Goal Setting – Richard Siffert

A. Section 2.5 Content:

- i. Some members believed option 1 fits within the regulatory content and provides needed flexibility. Others advocated for Option 2 because it takes into account supply and demand characteristics.
- ii. DOH needs to provide guidance on what goals should be. Don't want goal and performance to be onerous. Content must be reasonable and achievable, which should be linked to supply and demand characteristics. Utilities need assistance with setting benchmarks (based on size and location).
- iii. Recommend option 3 change to guidance with more information based on size and location.

V. Working Lunch

A. Roadmap:

- i. An updated version was given out. The Roadmap now starts with meeting 1.
- ii. Once the subcommittee report is completed, it will be reviewed by DOH staff in March 2005.
- iii. The final WUE Subcommittee report will be presented to the WSAC committee in April 2005. All WUE Subcommittee members are invited to attend the WSAC meeting to hear the recommendations/discussion.

B. The Process Planning Workgroup had a conference call on November 5, 2004. They discussed what has been done to date and agreed with the remaining schedule as outlined in the Roadmap.

C. Summary of Leakage Input from the Drinking Water Seminars:

- i. Jennifer Kropack was unable to attend the meeting. At the December 15, 2004 WUE Subcommittee, there will be a summary about the input received from the Drinking Water Seminars regarding the leakage standard.

ACTION: DOH staff will distribute the Leakage Standards Summary Report immediately.

D. Update – Other Stakeholder Involvement:

- i. Leslie Thorpe gave an update on the stakeholder involvement process. DOH is focusing on four stakeholders groups; 1) large customer (i.e. businesses), 2) local government (political side), 3) tribes, and 4) watershed groups.

- ii. Rich Hoey and Leslie will attend the meetings to discuss the law, the process DOH is taking, invite partnership, and to obtain feedback/comments from the groups. All feedback received from the groups will be presented to the WUE Subcommittee at the January 2005 meeting.

VI. Public Comment

Patti Godwin commented that the WUE Subcommittee is doing a wonderful job and members should be commended for a job well done.

VII. Continuation of Discussion: Performance Reporting and Accountability: Performance Reporting and Compliance – Richard Siffert

A. Section 3 Performance Reporting:

- i. A proposal was raised that the law states performance reporting does not include source and leakage information. Others did not agree and believe those should be included. DOH will look at language.

B. Section 3.3 Mechanisms:

- i. It was noted CCRs are a federal requirement. Do not want additional state requirements imposed.
- ii. CCRs go to the customers. WSPs and SWSMPs do not go to the customers. Option 1 may not be a good idea for a regular reporting to the public.
- iii. It was acknowledged that it would be easier for DOH and cost effective to put in the CCR. Smaller systems may prefer CCRs because they know they have to do it at a specified time.
- iv. Concerns were stated about customer perspective – water quality vs. performance. This may confuse customers.
- v. There seems agreement that DOH should not specify the mechanism and it should be left up to the utility's discretion.

C. Section 3.4 Frequency:

- i. Performance reporting needs to be more frequent than Option 1 – does not meet legislation purpose. Option 2 only system size – may want to include higher frequency for “enhanced”. Will need to deal with SWSMP frequency.
- ii. Prefer Option 2. Need to acknowledge data lag with reporting. If reporting is done annually, it is not necessary to do this in a non-critical basin.
- iii. One suggestion was the level of detail may vary based on size of system instead of varying frequency.

- iv. Comments were expressed about the cost. Better usage of time and money for small systems on doing conservation, rather than on reporting. It was recommended to look at trends of small systems. Small systems could do a multi-year reporting, such as 2 to 3 years. Is annual data valuable to small systems?
- v. Some recommended annual and relate to goals and decrease the level of detail. Need to think about audience and level of detail need to provide to DOH and customers.
- vi. Customers need to be educated on performance reporting, so they understand what it means to them. The public must get enough information to relate it to the goal.

D. Section 3.5 Level of Detail and Section 3.6 Content:

- i. Information in reports varies by size of water system. The larger the water system, the more detail provided in the report. The focus should be on content, not the level of detail.
- ii. It was recommended to put into a matrix form for different size water systems: option 1 for small, option 2 for medium, option 2 for large. Add supply and demand characteristics.
- iii. Some believed that one utility should be able to choose the items in the performance reporting. Others disagreed and believed that DOH should require certain data points for tracking.

E. Section 1 Compliance

- i. The compliance portion will not be written into the rule. DOH's priority compliance for enforcement purposes. Planning requirements fold into way we do business. We need to set priorities. General framework for how we use resources.

VIII. Cost Effectiveness Presentation – Deana Taylor

- A. Deana Taylor presented the draft Cost Effectiveness Workgroup Report. At the December 15, 2004 WUE meeting, there will be a discussion about the content of the report and subcommittee members can provide comments/feedback at that time. Deana noted that Cost Effectiveness is referenced in the law in two different places.

IX. Public Comment

Eric Nelson: The committee has discussed supply and demand characteristics throughout the day. When talking about supply characteristics, you must include what is forecasted for the supply. We need to know what is available now and how much is left and able to be taken (i.e. in the stream or in the aquifer). This information needs to be included in the utilities discussions on conservation.

X. Meeting Wrap-up/Next Meeting Topics

- A. The December 15, 2004 WUE Subcommittee Meeting will be held at the Marriott Hotel. Michelle will check on the parking situation at the hotel.

Next Subcommittee Meeting:	December 15, 2004	9:30 am to 4:00 pm
	Marriott, SeaTac	
	3201 South 176 th Street	
	Seattle, WA 98188	
	(206) 241-2000	